

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/801,785	03/09/2001	Tomohiko Serita	040894-5640	5548
9629	7590 07/27/2004		EXAM	INER
MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP 1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW			VANORE, DAVID A	
WASHINGTON, DC 20004		••	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•		2881	

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	09/801,785	SERITA, TOMOHIKO		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	David A Vanore	2881		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed rs will be considered timely. I the mailing date of this communication. CD (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 Ju	<u>ıne 2004</u> .			
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL. 2b)☐ This	action is non-final.			
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E				
Disposition of Claims				
 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	vn from consideration.			
Application Papers		•		
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on <u>08 November 2002</u> is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to the o Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	re: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objec drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ejected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.				
Attachment(s)	л П	(PTO 440)		
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:			

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed June 24, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant has argued that Baumann fails to anticipate the claims because Baumann fails to teach arranging both of a light emitter and light receiver in parallel with one face of a plate shaped object and a second light emitter and light receiver in parallel with another face of the plate or sheet shaped object.

Baumann specifically teaches the use of light emitters 11i and light detectors 12i to detect a body such as a briefcase. As discussed in the Advisory action mailed on June 2, 2004, a briefcase has the general shape of a rectangular prism, comporting to the rectangular object depicted in Fig. 5-7. A "plate-shaped" object also generally has the shape of a rectangular prism having a length, width, and thickness. Also, such a rectangular prism, or plate shaped object has a plurality of sides.

As the claim is written and as the arguments do not point out specific sides and the arrangement of the claimed optical sensors in relation to specific sides, Baumann does teach a first optical sensor in parallel with one face of an object and a second optical sensor arranged in parallel with another face of the object as required in claims 1-13 and pointed out in the previous Office actions.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Baumann.

Regarding claims 1-8 and 11, Baumann teaches a method and apparatus for detecting a plate or sheet shaped body having a plurality of optical emitters and receivers (11 and 12) parallel to each face of a body and one another, a first comparative circuit (15) and a second comparative circuit (20) for judging reference values from a detection signal received by receivers (12), and a control section 27 for outputting a plurality of different drive signals (28) to the plurality of light emitting means such that they are controllably turned on and off as recited in claims 1-3 and 11.

Further Figs. 1-4 show that the first and second optical sensor are disposed that light emitted in the second time period by the second light emitting section is direct on upon the second receiver and obliquely incident on the first receiver as recited in claim 4, the monitoring circuit comprises an output lever adjuster to normalize the output signal (Col. 4) as recited in claims 5, 7, and 11, the monitoring circuit comprises a comparative circuit to compare the output of a light receiving point and a first judgement reference value (Col. 3 Lines 4-57) as recited in claims 6 and 8.

Regarding claims 9, 10, 12, and 13, Baumann teaches all the limitations required in claims 1-8 and 11 as above and further teaches a no-load condition as defined in the specification at pages 5-6 is a condition where a body is not in a measurement stage. Newly submitted claims 9 and 10 require that a first output level is adjusted by a first output level adjustment means to adjust a first output of a first

Art Unit: 2881

judgement reference value which corresponds to a no-load condition. The examiner interprets this claim language to mean that the first output is adjusted to a value which corresponds to no body present for measurement in the device. Baumann recites an output adjustment means in the form of a diagnostic apparatus which selectively adjusts the outputs of a selected detector to zero, indicating that no body is present (Col. 9 Lines 21-44). Therefore, the diagnostic means of Baumann accomplishes the same essential function and method of that which is recited in claims 9 and 10.

Conclusion

This is a continuation of applicant's earlier Application No. 09/801,785. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 09/801,785 Page 5

Art Unit: 2881

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David A Vanore whose telephone number is (571) 272-2483. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John R. Lee can be reached on (571) 272-2477. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

dav

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800